

REMARKS

Claims 1-68 are presently active. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the obvious efforts required to examine all of the claims now active in the present matter.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 7-12, 18-23, 25-27, 31-55, 43-47, 52-55, 57-58, 62-65, and 68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Perkowski (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,979). Claims 3-6, 13-17, 24, 28-30, 36-42, 48-51, 56, 59-61 and 66-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Perkowski in view of Gottsman (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,548).

Applicant acknowledges that Perkowski, on quick review, appears to teach retrieving displaying information about a part by using the part's unique product identifier (e.g., its UPC code) to locate a relevant web page describing the item (Perkowski col. 19). However, as has been previously submitted by Applicant, Perkowski fails to teach replacements for parts dependent on other parts. That is, while Perkowski may allow one to retrieve maintenance or servicing information (col. 19 lines 19-20), Perkowski does *not* teach that if one part is identified, a search should be performed to determine whether there is a related or dependent part that should *a/so* be replaced along with the identified part.

Thus, even if we assume Perkowski may provide one with the entire technical manual for some device indicating all parts that may be replaced, Applicant submits that mere possession of such a manual does not enable one to perform the recited embodiments.

In reviewing the claims, Applicant acknowledges that the recited "should be replaced" language, while intended to limit the claims to replacement dependency discussed above, may not be as clearly claimed as it could be. Consequently, Applicant has amended each independent claim series to more clearly recite determining a replacement dependency between a first and second part, where this dependency facilitates retrieval of replacement related information for the second part based at least in part on the determined dependency.

Applicant submits the recited dependency checking is not taught or suggested by Perkowski or Gottsman, whether these documents are considered individually or one in view of the other. Since all rejections rely on Perkowski, Applicant submits the present rejections to all claims have been overcome.

Regarding the rejection of the dependent claims, applicant submits these claims introduce limitations, which when considered in the context of their independent claims, are not found in the documents relied on by the Office. These claims are also allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable base claims.

Regarding the rejection of claims 43, 57 and 68 in particular, however, although speech recognition is known, Applicant submits utilizing oral utterances in this part replacement context is a non-trivial and non-obvious usage of oral utterances and therefore is patentably distinct over the cited art.


CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that that all active claims are presently in condition for allowance, and their passage to issuance is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 21, 2003


Steven D. Yates
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 42,242
(503) 264-6589

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

21 May 2003

Date of Deposit

DEBORAH J. HUGHAN

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

204450 5/21/03

Signature

Date